

ED 010 224

1-31-67 24

(REV)

ISSUES AND STRATEGIES IN THE PUBLIC ACCEPTANCE OF EDUCATIONAL CHANGE.

GOLDHAMMER, KEITH

RQR60230 UNIVERSITY OF OREGON, EUGENE

BR-5-0217-10

OP-10

18-NOV-65

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.09 HC-\$1.08 27P.

*PUBLIC SUPPORT, *INNOVATIONS, *EDUCATIONAL IMPROVEMENT,
*EDUCATIONAL PROBLEMS, *ORGANIZATION CHANGES, SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION,
SOCIAL INFLUENCES, EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH, EDUCATIONAL CHANGES, EUGENE,
OREGON

ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE STUDIES AND FACTORS AFFECTING EDUCATIONAL CHANGE WERE DISCUSSED. A REVIEW OF SOME STUDIES INDICATED THAT ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE IS USUALLY SEEN AS ACCEPTANCE OF CHANGE BY PARTICIPANTS WITHIN AN ORGANIZATION. FIVE CATEGORIES OF FACTORS AFFECTING THE PUBLIC ACCEPTANCE OF EDUCATIONAL CHANGE WERE DISCUSSED. AVAILABLE RESEARCH FROM FIELDS OTHER THAN EDUCATION SUGGESTED THAT THE FACTORS DISCUSSED WERE (1) THE PUBLIC'S IMAGE OF THE ADVOCATE OF CHANGE, (2) THE PUBLIC'S IMAGE OF THE ORGANIZATION AND THE ENDS WHICH IT SERVES, (3) THE PUBLIC'S VIEW OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES, (4) THE CONGRUENCE OF THE PROPOSED CHANGE WITH GENERALLY ACCEPTED VALUES AND RECOGNIZED SOCIAL NEEDS, AND (5) SITUATIONAL FACTORS WHICH FACILITATE OR IMPEDE THE ACCEPTANCE OF CHANGE. CONCLUSIONS INDICATED THAT INNOVATIONS IN EDUCATION WERE NOT ALWAYS WELL RECEIVED BY THE PUBLIC. A DECIDING FACTOR THAT THE CHANGE AGENT NEEDED TO RECOGNIZE WAS THAT HE WAS DEALING WITH POLITICAL PROBLEMS. (RS)



Occasional Paper, No 10

Center for the
Advanced
Study of
Educational
Administration

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON
Eugene

ISSUES AND STRATEGIES IN THE PUBLIC
ACCEPTANCE OF EDUCATIONAL CHANGE

By

Keith Goldhammer

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the
person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions
stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education
position or policy.

**ISSUES AND STRATEGIES IN THE PUBLIC ACCEPTANCE
OF EDUCATIONAL CHANGE**

**Keith Goldhammer
Associate Dean**

**School of Education
UNIVERSITY OF OREGON**

**Presented to the Conference on
EDUCATIONAL ISSUES IN A CHANGING WORLD**

Kaanapali Beach

Maui, Hawaii

November 18, 1965

Introduction

Most studies of organizational change have centered upon the acceptance of change by participants within an organization. This has been a reasonable approach since it is obvious that change in organizational practices involves modification of the behavior of individuals who perform roles within the organization. It is also evident that changes cannot be accomplished if they provoke rejection or broad-scaled dissatisfaction among either a policy-controlling or a consuming public.

[Some studies have been made of the acceptance of change by an external public. The focus has been upon the problems of change where acceptance involves behavioral adaptations on the part of the acceptor. Cases in point are Lewin's studies of attempts to change public attitudes toward certain meats during the war,¹ and Gallaher's study of the acceptance of change by the people of Plainville.² But public acceptance of change in education generally follows a different pattern. In education the key factor is the public's acceptance of the anticipated consequences of change for their children, for the perpetuation of values they deem significant, or for the costs which change may incur. Little is actually every demanded in the form of accommodation or adjustment of behaviors to changed programs or procedures. No research on this problem has been discovered; as a consequence, this paper must be based upon speculation, a few findings from the writer's research, and educational implications of findings from research in related fields.]

The school, as all other institutions and agencies of society, is not a completely closed or independent social system. Contrary to popular belief, the school never has been completely sequestered from the rest of the world. The ivy-covered, ivory tower was more a contemptuous derogation of the educational function than an actuality. The students and teachers come from the outside world. The school derives its support from that world. The school and its goals are a part of the conflicts in aspirations and values which exist in the outside world. The people who make or permit policy to be formed in the school live in the outside world and inevitably attempt to establish the compelling policies of the schools in conformity with desires and values particularly of that part of the world to which they subscribe.

In describing the general functions and problems of organizations, Parsons³ identifies the institutional level of concern, in which the organization relates itself to the broader society of which it is a part and for which it performs certain functions or services. A part, then, of the problem of the organization is that of adaptation, where the processes and programs of the organization must be adjusted or accommodated to the realistic demands of the environment in which it is located. But for the schools, and probably most other essential service functions, the problem is not one of simple accommodation. On the one hand, the social needs with respect to the function may be in constant flux, and the organization may have to make constant adjustments to the changing environmental needs. On the other hand, the functions of the organization, itself, may be undergoing some rapid changes as the result of accumulated experience, the refinement of the

technology, the redefinition of goals, or the extension of the knowledge base of its operations through research and experimentation. Parsons has pointed out that one aspect of the adaptive function of an organization is that of accommodating itself to the demands of the environment. [And Wengert⁴ has suggested that a part of the responsibility of any administrator is to change the external system to coincide with the needs and demands of the organization.]

To the extent that these reflections adequately describe the problems of a school organization faced with demands for change, it is inevitable that the educator, in addition to his concern for the organizational climate within the schools, will pay a great deal of attention to the "extra-organizational" climate - the climate of opinions, of values, of aspirations, of prejudices, of benevolences, and tolerance represented in the broader community. At least one strategy of the educator in effecting change within the public schools is that of gaining a sufficient amount of public acceptance of the change to insure that the normal processes of operations within the school organization are not adversely affected by antagonistic attitudes. A study of "Jackson County" by Goldhammer and Farner⁵ shows that an accumulation of public antagonism toward the broad-scale introduction of new educational programs and techniques resulted in a coalition of disaffected internal and external participants, and a successful "counter revolution" produced major attacks upon the integrity of school leaders and endangered the educational stability of the school system. The history of education since the termination of World War II is replete with instances where popular reaction to proposals for change have been so negative as to

sweep the administration out of office and to reconstruct the social system to one which is more traditional and perpetuative of the status quo.

Factors Affecting the Public Acceptance of Educational Change

The research available from fields other than education suggests that there are five categories of factors which are related to the public's acceptance of change.

1. The Public's Image of the Advocate of Change

There is increasing evidence that the most important single factor related to the public's acceptance of change is its image of the advocate. In education the problem is complicated by the public's perception of where the source of educational expertise lies in the school organization. The problem of securing public acceptance of change varies according to who in the school organization appears to be the advocate of change. In Jackson County a considerable number of citizens felt that the administration imposed changes contrary to the desires of the teachers. Because of their contacts with a few vocal teachers who were antagonistic to some of the proposed changes, some of the citizens felt that there was general professional antagonism to the proposed changes. They held that teachers constituted the primary sources of educational expertise, and administrators were less well-prepared to judge the educational validity and effectiveness of proposed adaptations. These citizens felt that the teachers were representing the educational needs of the children in the local community, while the professional administrators were imposing directives from the educational profession outside of the community, and their proposals could be considered contrary to local educational interests and aspirations.⁶

The increasing professionalism in education, coupled with the growing complexity and size of communities and school systems, has made the educator more remote from the community and more suspect in his values than was true in earlier times. Several studies have shown that the professional educator, primarily the school administrator, who is removed from direct contact with children and parents, is considered an "alien expert" who, [according to Vidich and Bensman,] "knows the ways and laws of the world, and who uses this knowledge to shape the community as it bears on him and his ends which are necessarily in the selfish interests of educations."⁷

Gallaher found that there were three personal variables of the change advocate which deeply affected the acceptance of his proposals by the general public; these factors were his prestige within the community, his personality, and the personal relationships which linked him to the potential acceptors.⁸ A fourth factor might be of equal importance for an advocate who holds an official authoritative position within the community -- namely, the manner in which he uses the authority incumbent to his position.

These factors suggest that the ability of the advocate to gain the acceptance of school patrons is related to the degree to which they accept him as being either "of the community" or whose interests, concerns, and aspirations are congruent with those of the community. To gain the confidence and respect of the community, he must be accepted both as an authority on education and as an adherent to the stable values and goals of the community. If he is the kind of person in whom the community has confidence, his proposals for change may well be considered "domestic"

rather than "alien." His image as "of the community" will be enhanced to the extent that he is personally known by, and has access to, influential citizens of the community. The breadth of his identification among groups who are concerned about school affairs is of central importance. All too frequently the educator identifies exclusively with business and professional groups -- groups who represent middle-class, white-collared values and perspectives. Where there is "class consciousness" within the community, such narrow identification constitutes an impediment to his acceptance by some groups who may label him a "tool" of special interests incongruent with their own.

There is also some evidence to suggest that if the individual occupies an official, authoritative position within the community, his image will be affected by the manner in which he exercises the authority of his office. To the extent that he imposes his authority upon the community, the image of him as an alien expert is likely to be reinforced and his proposals rejected. The current tendency of professional educators to assume the roles of professional experts, who know what is best educationally for the children and the community, and who should be accorded the privilege of determining all educational policies, further divorces the educator from the public whose acceptance he must secure. [The educator may be viewed as patronizing the public and belittling their intelligence. These factors have led Benne⁹ to suggest that the person who assumes the role of an advocate of change must utilize the authority of his position in accordance with the democratic norms legitimated by our culture. Gallaher, too, suggests that individuals will be much more likely to accept proposals for change when they are involved in the decision-making process than when they are not.¹⁰

It would seem from the evidence that the personality of the advocate, his socially visible relationships among the individuals who are influential among various groups within the community, and the manner in which he relates his expertness and authority to the people whose support he needs are all critical factors in the public's acceptance of his proposals.

2. The Public's Image of the Organization and the Ends which it Serves

How the public views the schools in the community and their objectives appears to be a second critical factor in its acceptance of proposals for educational change. In a study of public attitudes toward the acceptance of new school programs in Eugene and Springfield, Oregon, Agger¹¹ found that a highly favorable attitude toward the public schools resulted in a greater readiness to accept the specific innovations. He speculated that such a relationship appeared to be the product both of high valuation placed upon education and public confidence in the effectiveness of the schools in the community. He stated that policy attitudes among the general public seemed to be a function of their approval or disapproval of the operations of the schools and their image of the adequacy or inadequacy of the schools in regard to some basic social and educational values. If the school organization is not perceived as adequate to accomplish desired objectives, it is apparent that there will be a reluctance on the part of the public either to endorse new programs or to allocate additional resources to the schools for the development of new programs for fear that the resources allocated will be misspent.

Miles¹² suggests that it would be poor policy for any organization that does not have a healthy state of operations to embark upon

extensive programs of change. He indicates two areas of organizational health which relate specifically to the public's acceptance of the organization's proposals for change. These are the adequacy of communication and the autonomy of the organization.

Adequate communication with the public requires a free transmission of information, both to and from the relevant publics, but it also indicates a further factor which is frequently neglected in the analysis of the communication process. There is a need for each participant to receive the messages transmitted, and also that he give some indication that he has reacted meaningfully to the messages. The school organization which shows no evidence that it has responded adequately to the suggestions of citizens of the community is likely to be viewed as unresponsive or indifferent to what the community actually desires. The lack of responsiveness constitutes a barrier to further communication and engenders loss of confidence. [In Jackson County,¹³ the citizens frequently felt that the administrators were so obsessed with the pursuit of goals which they had established that they were indifferent to suggestions and desires of the citizens. At a point of crisis, a large number of citizens assumed that the only way they could effectively make their wishes known was to select vigorous opponents to the proposed changes for school board positions.]

A second factor related to the image which the organization obtains in the community is that which Miles labels autonomy. A healthy organization is one which has established a fine balance between its own independence from the community and its responsiveness to the community. Some organizations may respond passively to all demands from outside,

perceiving themselves, in effect, as tools of the environment. From this perspective, their behaviors can be erratic, and the stability of programming adversely affected. The healthy organization will exert its autonomy when faced by community pressures, but it will not respond defensively or rebelliously to the demands of the environment.

[Vidich and Bensman¹⁴ point out that one of the problems of the administrator's relations with the citizens of Springdale resulted from the fact that the administrator recognized the range of diverse interests which existed in the community and endeavored to try to agree with everyone to such an extent that his public statements were so general as to be innocuous to all groups. The result of such behavior on the part of the administrator, of course, is that no one feels the need to respond any more positively to his proposals than he does to theirs.]

The public's view of the organization as responsive but responsible is an essential factor in the acceptance of change. The public must know that its perspectives and desires are taken into account in decision-making, but it must also have confidence in the stability and integrity of decision-making on the part of school officials.

3. The Public's View of the Proposed Changes

There is no evidence to suggest that the public will accept changes just for the sake of change. Gallaher¹⁵ concluded that an important factor in the acceptance of change by the public was the meanings which people see for themselves in the innovation that is proposed. When desired objectives are viewed as attainable through the proposed innovations, they are rather readily accepted, but the vaguer, the less specific, the less direct the advantages and significance of the innovations to the

citizens, the less likely they will be to favor the proposed changes.

In Jackson County,¹⁶ many of the citizens did not see how proposed innovations actually related to the goals which they held to be important for the public schools. They saw some of the proposed changes as actually antithetical to their aspirations. Many of the citizens had moved to Jackson County to escape the deteriorating school conditions of the central city, and they felt that their children, educated in the Jackson County Schools, would have a better opportunity for admission to prestige universities. But they feared that some of the changes were reducing the academic quality of the curriculum. They viewed this as inharmonious with their aspirations, and they resisted those innovations.

In a study of the unification of a metropolitan community, Hawley and Zimmer¹⁷ discovered that one of the key factors in the citizens' rejection of the proposed change was their failure to understand the significance of the change for the area which would be served by the metropolitan government. Understanding neither the consequences nor advantages of the unification, they developed antagonistic attitudes toward those who were promoting the change. The authors concluded that an understanding of the nature of the proposed changes and the consequences which might ensue from them was imperative before a favorable response to the proposed changes could be secured.

It is entirely reasonable to expect that individuals will tend to support those proposed changes which they see as clearly related to values which they will gain from them. The more ambiguity that surrounds the proposed changes or the consequences derived from such changes, the greater will be the tendency to view the proposals with suspicion, hostility, or indifference.

4. The Congruence of the Proposed Change with Generally Accepted Values and Recognized Social Needs

Aside from factors related to the personality and personal relationships of the advocator of change, the most important single factor associated with the public's acceptance of proposals for change is the degree to which the change is perceived as congruent with accepted values and relevant to purposes which have significant meanings. [In their second study of Middletown, the Lynds wrote:

The community places its greatest hope in its schools as instruments of 'progress' when that progress is assumed to be a continuous straight-line development along the lines which Middletown understands and believes in; economic and material expansion under the familiar doctrine of 'individual liberty.' The community fears the schools as leading to change if this progress is along unknown and possibly 'dangerous' lines, which cannot be predicted and which may lead the young to ways unfamiliar to their fathers. It wants the schools to train more intelligent citizens, but it has a profound distrust of too much 'cleverness' or novelty if applied to practical affairs. It wants character development but not to the point of raising difficult questions in regard to current group practices.¹⁸

W. Lloyd Warner and his associates expressed a similar point of view in their study of Jonesville more than ten years later. They pointed out that the members of the school board of Jonesville had close and coordinate relations almost exclusively with people of their own classes and they tended to operate the schools so as to perpetuate the values of the people with whom they were in closest relationships. They stated,

The board of education has been concerned primarily with two things: the operation of the schools as economically as possible, and conformity by the teachers to conservative, economical, political, religious, and moral doctrines, both in the classroom and in their private lives. The school is viewed as an indispensable but expensive institution by the members of the board. They believe it should reflect in its administration and teaching all that is traditionally good and wholesome in middle-western smalltown life -- if it does not cost too much.^{19]}

[Both of these studies were prepared at periods when a climate conducive to change did not characterize midwestern communities. The student of a contemporary community would probably come to the same conclusion were he looking globally at all of the prevailing social functions and forces of the community.] Relatively few, if any, social systems could tolerate massive changes revolutionizing the entire core of their existence at any one time. Consequently, changes must be made in most social systems with respect to relatively few aspects of their existence, and changes have the greatest potential for achieving acceptance if they are meaningful to the public and are congruent with the basic value structures to which the citizens adhere. Changes which threaten the hard core values of the community or the disruption of the kinds of social relations to which the community has accommodated itself are likely to be rejected. Let children really develop skill in critical thinking to the extent that they question the basic conventions to which the community subscribes, or challenge the status systems which accord power and prestige to adults and force children to live in a dependent autocracy, and [no matter how realistic these changes are or how harmonious with the goal of freeing the individual's capacity to act independent of personal or social constraints (an accepted goal of American culture),] and the antagonism of broad elements of the community will surely be aroused.

The studies of Warner, Gallaher, the Lynds, among others -- all suggest that there is an inherent conservatism among the American people, and if proposed changes help to solidify that conservative atmosphere and even suggest an improvement in societal operations in accordance with these perspectives, they will be highly approved.

Americans prize efficiency of operations. Justify a change in terms of greater efficiency in attaining desired objectives, and it will be as inviolable of attack as motherhood and the flag. Justify proposed changes in public education on the basis that they will reduce the costs of education to the taxpayer, and there will be legions of support regardless of the educational merits of the proposed experiment. Produce statistics to show how the proposed change will lead to higher levels of academic achievement and the potentiality for more ready acceptance into the more sophisticated colleges and universities, and the parents who are yearning for their children's admittance to institutions of prestige will readily support the proposed innovations. But the people to whom college attendance offers no particular inducement will either be indifferent or hostile because this goal is not relevant to their culture, and greater effectiveness of operations for the attainment of a goal to which they are indifferent is of no consequence or concern to them.

In his studies of school desegregation, Cook²⁰ found that a significant factor in the acceptance of the necessity for desegregation was the recognition on the part of the public of gains that would accompany the change but were not directly related to the change itself. Some communities developed more positive attitudes toward desegregation when they found it would stimulate new industries in their locale or solve costly building problems. For other communities the more recent discovery that federal funds might be denied to them for many kinds of projects, including education, has certainly been a stimulus to consider desegregation.

[Gallaher²¹ emphasizes the need for the advocate's understanding of the value system into which he is introducing change, because the system functions as a major screening device through which the judgments of the potential acceptors are finally made.]

The question may well be asked in this connection: "Why did the public reject the principles of progressivism, which are now camouflaged in many current proposals for change, but accept the less fundamental propositions of 'new' educational reforms?" The answer is easily substantiated. Progressivism was radical. It suggested an implementation of the social philosophy [verbally subscribed to by the American public]. The progressives said crassly to the American people, ". . .these are your ideals, now here is what you have to do to make your behavior conform to your beliefs." The school's role was to challenge the way of life and to alter the home, the family, the business relationship, and the legitimated ways of society. Clearly progressivism was a threat to a way of life and outside of the American public's zone of tolerance.

A further point of considerable significance lay in the fact that progressivism had no economic backers. It was antithetical to the legitimate culture and no one cared to underwrite it. A few manufacturers could be stimulated to change the color of chalkboard and furniture, but there was no revolution to excite and stimulate new industry, or to claim the support of new advertising campaigns. The stakes were ideological, and ideology is not well received by a practical and business-minded public.

The progressivists were critics of society and of the manner in which the public neglected or rejected some of the basic tenets of

democracy to which they, as a group, were dedicated. As critics, they were looked upon as outsiders, and suspicions were readily aroused relative to their motives and the values of their proposals for reform. Instead of beginning with the people, whose attitudes toward education they sought to change, the progressivists separated themselves from the public, were viewed as against them, and adopted a supercilious attitude toward those who did not readily accept their proposals. The zeal and evangelical image of a reformer are probably the chief barriers to the public's acceptance of his platform.

But the case of the contemporary advocates of the new education is quite different. In addition to beginning with the value orientations of the American public, they are achieving recognition of education as a salable commodity, and this concept is harmonious with the business culture predominate in American culture. They are calling upon education to make a better utilization of the resources of our technological society. Advertising is stimulated to sell the new education because it is good for business, and educational reform is so well legitimated by our present culture that it warrants front page news, both in the Wall Street Journal and the Financial Section of the Sunday New York Times. No greater evidence of the congruence of proposals to change with the dominant themes of the culture is needed. The proposals for changing the educational enterprise into the "new education" are legitimated because they are neither a threat nor a challenge to those ends which have been traditionally prized by the influential and policy-making authorities of the culture.

5. Situational Factors which Facilitate or Impede the Acceptance of Change

Educational changes do not take place under laboratory conditions. One can never really study a social system at work and isolate only those variables the effects of which he wishes to observe. The complexity of human social systems makes them extremely difficult to study, and both the social scientist and the social engineer are constantly faced with the necessity of explaining the unanticipated consequences of their efforts when seemingly all of the pertinent variables were favorable for producing the desired results. The aim of the scientist is always the accumulation of knowledge sufficient to give him the power to predict the consequences of particular combinations of variables. Prediction is always hazardous in social situations.

There is some evidence, however, that there are some identifiable situational factors which are conducive to the acceptance of change or vice versa. Crises of a general magnitude, for example, may create conditions conducive to the acceptance of change. The near hopeless conditions of the Great Depression produced almost immediate receptivity to the first strategies of the New Deal. The people were ready to try almost anything which promised to give them relief from the prevailing, oppressive, economic conditions.

An event that threatens the security of a people may produce receptivity to change. The bombing of Pearl Harbor and the communist invasion of South Korea resulted in the acceptance of changes which were previously heatedly resisted by the general public.

From this short perspective, it appears as though Sputnik made the American people receptive to educational change, because they

feared loss of prestige, defeat in the cold war, and shortages in technically trained manpower which might weaken our defenses against an increasingly aggressive, potential enemy. Situational factors of critical magnitude result in dramatic events or consequences. There are other situational factors which influence change, but which are not so startling.

Gallaher²² concluded that in Plainville an important factor in the acceptance of change, during the period intervening between West's study of the community and his, was the localized interference of centralized agencies with the community. The Lynds,²³ too, found that changes had occurred in Middletown between their first and second studies as a result of the pressures of centralized authorities, emanating from both the state and national governments. Their findings would indicate that the legitimation of change by the educational office of the federal government or a state department of education may have beneficial effects upon the acceptance of change by the general public, provided that the U. S. office or the state department of education has an image as a reliable authority and is respected for its judicious assistance of local communities to solve problems which are meaningful and important to them. This was clearly the case in Goldhammer's study²⁴ of the effects of the Oregon standardization program, where the opposition to change and to the power of the Oregon State Department of Education to invoke sanctions against recalcitrant school districts was overcome by the judicious, considerate, and helpful manner in which the program was administered.

Both Gallaher and the Lynds also observed how the declining provincialism of their communities had a favorable effect upon the establishment of climates more receptive to change. One may conclude that

the more isolated the community, and the smaller, the more tradition-bound and provincial it is, the more difficulty will the change agent experience in attempting to effect his program. A community with a "cosmopolitan" population -- a population which relates itself to the outer world and maintains regularized relationships with broader social contacts -- will probably be more receptive. Gallaher²⁵ concluded, as well, that the travel of Plainvillers during the war was instrumental in broadening the perspectives of the inhabitants of the community and establishing a climate more favorable for the introduction of changes. Goldhammer and Farnier found also two distinct groups with divergent attitudes toward educational reform in Jackson County.²⁶ The locals were long-time residents who feared the breakdown of traditional values and social relations as a result of the influx of population. They resisted attempts to change the educational system. The cosmopolitans were either newcomers to the county or older residents whose interests, occupations, and training led them to be oriented to more global problems than those restricted chiefly to the county. They wanted a more comprehensive educational program for their children and the most up-to-date practices which could be employed.

The study of Jackson County also indicated that fear of loss of prestige and status made parents receptive to proposed educational changes even when some of them appeared to have low potential for accomplishing the desired ends.

The Lynds²⁷ listed several factors which they felt facilitated community acceptance of change: the ability of the community to afford the changes financially, the relative urgency with which its problems pressed upon it, the tenacity of its traditions, the presence or absence

of strong local personalities with an interest in a particular change, the rate of change of the larger culture surrounding it, and the development in the larger culture of satisfactory criteria for measuring the amount and intensity of social lag in the community. They noted, however, that in Middletown, the main impetus for change in all institutions came from the influence of outside agencies and the emergencies which occurred in the broader society and appeared in the life of the local community.

There is not so much direct evidence of the factors which might impede the acceptance of change, although, by implication, the reverse of each of the favorable factors might be so considered. It was noted that in Jackson County political conflicts in the local community and competition for power over local affairs created a climate in which the school board's and school administrators' programs for change became one of the issues in the political campaign. The presence of extreme dislocations, resulting from the rapid population growth, increases in taxation, and changing power relations created a climate in which any controversial issue could be fanned into a major political and social conflagration. It might well be concluded from this study that it is extremely hazardous to embark upon programs of educational change where other situational factors have produced unsettled local relationships.

CONCLUSION

The best innovations in education may not always find a readily receptive public. Where strong local traditions for self-government in education prevail, the formal and informal actions of the public in response to proposals for change can either facilitate or impair the

adoption of the proposals. The change agent in education, be he teacher, administrator, school board member, private citizen, or governmental functionary, needs to recognize that he is dealing with political problems and the reasonableness of his case may not be the primary, deciding factor. Careful strategies for the proposing of new practices, for approaching the various publics concerned, for providing information, and for relating the changes to both values and goals which are important to the publics and congruent with their cultural expectations -- all are important considerations in the development of the "winning" strategies.

It is doubtful that any blueprints or formula can be proposed. The probabilities for success must be carefully weighed, and each human situation must be individually analyzed. One might only conclude that there appears to be rather low probability that even when favorable climates for change exist -- even when the public clamors for change in education as they do now -- the public would accept, even reluctantly, the radical or global educational reforms which are genuinely needed. The ancient problem of maintaining stability throughout periods of change appears still to be the key issue.

FOOTNOTES

1. Lewin, Kurt, "Group Decision and Social Change" in Swanson, Newcomb, and Hartley, (Eds), Readings in Social Psychology, New York: Henry Holt, 1952.
2. Gallaher, Art, Plainville Fifteen Years Later, New York: Columbia University Press, 1961.
3. Parsons, Talcott, "An Outline of the Social System" in Parsons Shils, Naegle, and Pitts, Theories of Society, Glencoe: The Free Press, 1961, pp. 30-81.
4. Wengert, E. S., "The Prototype," in Wengert, Harwood, Marquis, and Goldhammer, The Study of Administration, Eugene, Oregon: School of Business Administration, University of Oregon, 1961.
5. Goldhammer, Keith and Farner, Frank, The Jackson County Story, Eugene, Oregon: The Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, 1964.
6. Ibid.
7. Vidich, Arthur J., and Bensman, Joseph, Small Town in Mass Society, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1958, p. 195. See also Goldhammer, Keith, "The Administrator and His Community," American School Board Journal, (October, 1959) pp. 27-30.
8. Gallaher, op. cit. Chapter 7.
9. Benne, Kenneth, "Goal and Value Dilemmas in Planning Change," in Bennis, Benne, and Chin, (Eds), The Planning of Change, New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1961, p. 142.
10. Gallaher, Art, "Directed Change in Formal Organizations: The School System," in Carlson, (Ed), Change Processes in the Public Schools, Eugene, Oregon: The Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, 1965, pp. 37-54.
11. Agger, Robert E., "The Politics of Local Education: A Comparative Study in Community Decision-Making," in Tope, (Ed), A Forward Look - The Preparation of School Administrators, 1970, Eugene, Oregon: The Bureau of Educational Research, 1960, pp. 131-172.
12. Miles, Matthew B., "Planned Change and Organizational Health: Figure and Ground," in Carlson, op. cit., pp. 11-34.

Footnotes - Concluded

13. Goldhammer and Farner, op. cit.
14. Vidich and Bensman, op. cit., pp. 145-146.
15. Gallaher, Plainville Fifteen Years Later. Op. cit., pp. 252-253.
16. Goldhammer and Farner, op. cit.
17. Hawley, Amos. H., and Zimmer, Basil G., "Resistance to Unification in a Metropolitan Community," in Janowitz, (Ed), Community Political Systems, Glencoe: The Free Press, 1961, p. 182.
18. Lynd, Robert S. and Helen Morrell, Middletown in Transition, New York: Harcourt Brace, 1937, p. 240.
19. Warner, W. Lloyd, et al, Democracy in Jonesville, New York: Harper and Row, 1949, p. 196.
20. Cook, Stuart W., "Desegregation: A Psychological Analysis," in Charters and Gage, (Ed), Readings in the Social Psychology of Education, Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1963, pp. 40-51.
21. Gallaher, Art., "The Role of the Advocate and Directed Change," In Media and Educational Innovation, Lincoln, Nebraska: The University of Nebraska, 1964.
22. Gallaher, Plainville Fifteen Years Later, op. cit., Chapter 7.
23. Lynd, op. cit., Chapter XIII.
24. Goldhammer, Keith, "The Oregon Standardization Program" in Romney, (Ed), A Study of the Basic School Support Fund in Oregon, Eugene, Oregon: School of Education, University of Oregon, 1954.
25. Gallaher, op. cit., Chapter 7.
26. Goldhammer and Farner, op. cit.
27. Lynd, op. cit., p. 204.